The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Phaedrus and Seneca

J. P. Postgate

The Classical Review / Volume 33 / Issue 1-2 / February 1919, pp 19 - 24

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00012300, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00012300

How to cite this article:

J. P. Postgate (1919). Phaedrus and Seneca. The Classical Review, 33, pp 19-24
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00012300

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

submit, suppose a lacuna after λέγων ὅτι (Heylbut, p. 156, 17), which has lost us the quotation from Theophrastus; and probably not only this but also the comment of Aspasius on the first part of c. 14, § 6 (1154b, 9-13) ὁμοίως δ'

ἐν . . . εἰσίν, a passage on which a commentator might reasonably have something to say.

C. M. MULVANY.

Queen's College,
Benares.

PHAEDRUS AND SENECA.

THOSE who whether from duty or inclination have to busy themselves with the ragged text of Phaedrus will not consider it superfluous to inquire whether any help may be won from consideration of the writings of one who in respect of age of metre and to a certain extent in subject-matter and tone stands nearest to their author. M. Havet has subjected the treatment of the iambic trimeter by the fabulist and the tragedian to a strict comparison. With this I do not deal. What he has noted outside this sphere will be included in my collections if relevant and distinctive enough for my purpose. I shall submit my material first and reserve comments and deductions for the sequel. Its illustrative value will thus be unimpaired, and its evidential force in no way prejudged.

The agreements between Phaedrus and Seneca that I shall register are firstly those of substance, that is of thought or subject-matter; and secondly those of form, that is of expression and vocabulary. The few in which there is agreement of both will naturally come in between. On the agreements to which an asterisk is attached something more will be said below.

Phaedrus I. xxiil. 3 sq. 'nocturnus cum fur panem misisset cani | obiecto temptans an cibo posset capi.'

Seneca *de Constantia Sapientis* 14. 2 'illum, quisquis erit, tamquam canem acrem obiecto cibo leniet.'

Phaedrus III. viii. 14 sqq. "Cotidie" inquit "speculo uos uti uolo; | tu formam ne corrumpas nequitiae malis; | tu faciem ut istam moribus uincas bonis," cf. *ib.* 1 'praecepto monitus saepe te considera.'

Seneca *N.Q.* I. 16. 4 'inuenta sunt specula ut homo ipse se nosset, multa

ex hoc consecuturus, primum sui notitiam, deinde ad quaedam consilium; formosus ut uitaret infamiam, deformis ut sciret redimendum esse uirtutibus quicquid corpori deesset' e.q.s. (*Imitatus fortasse Phaedrum Seneca, Havet ad loc.*).

Phaedrus III. xv. The subject of this fable, the Lamb in quest of its foster-mother the Goat, is 'facit parentes bonitas, non necessitas' (v. 18).

Seneca *de Beneficiis* III. 29. 3-31 examines in the same spirit and with the same results the view that the mere gift of life is no claim upon the gratitude of a child.

Phaedrus III. xviii. and Appendix ii. 5 sqq. enumerate the characteristic excellences of various animals. The moral is that we should be content with what is assigned to us by Providence.

Seneca *de Beneficiis* II. 29. 1 sq. (cf. *Epist. Moral.* 124. 22) has a similar enumeration; and his moral is the same.

Phaedrus III. epil. 10 'nam uita morti propior est cotidie.'

Seneca *Epist. Moral.* 120. 17 'nihil satis est morituris, immo morientibus. cotidie enim propius ab ultimo stamus.'

*Phaedrus IV. vii. 9 'fabricasset Argus opere Palladio ratem.'

Seneca *Med.* 365 sqq. 'non Palladia | compacta manu regum referens | inclita remos quaeritur Argo.'

Phaedrus IV. 10. 1-3 'Peras imposuit Iuppiter nobis duas: | propriis repletam uitiis post tergum dedit, | alienis ante pectus suspendit grauem.'

Seneca *de Ira* II. 28. 8 'aliena uitia in oculis habemus, a tergo nostra sunt.'

Phaedrus IV. vii. 25 sq. 'hoc illis dictum est qui stultitia nausiant | et, ut putentur sapere, caelum uituperant.'

Seneca *Epist. Moral.* 107 fin. 'at contra ille (animus) pusillus et degener

qui obluctatur et de ordine mundi male existimat et emendare mauult deos quam se.' For the 'querellae nausiantis animi' see *de Constantia* 10. 2.

Phaedrus IV. xvii. fin. 'Parce gaudere oportet et sensim queri, | totam quis uitam miscet dolor et gaudium.'

Seneca *Epist. Moral.* 110. 4 'si sapis, omnia humana condicione metire: simul et quod gaudes et quod times contrahe.'

*Phaedrus IV. xxii. (xxiii.) 14 "mecum" inquit "mea sunt cuncta" (cf. 25 sq.), the words of Simonides.

Seneca *de Constantia Sapientis* 5. 6 'Megara Demetrius ceperat cui cognomen Poliorcetes fuit. ab hoc Stilbon' (should be Stilpon) 'et philosophus interrogatus num aliquid perdidisset; "Nihil;" inquit "omnia mea mecum sunt," and so again in *Epist. Moral.* 9. 18 sq. at somewhat greater length (compare Diogenes Laertius 2. 11. 4).

Phaedrus *ibidem* 14 sq. 'tunc pauci enatant | quia plures onere degrauati perierunt.'

Seneca *Epist. Moral.* 22. 12 'nemo cum sarcinis enatat.'

Phaedrus IV. epil. 3 sq. 'Sed temperatae suaues sunt argutiae, | immodicae offendunt.'

Seneca *de Constantia Sapientis* 16 fin. 'iocis temperatis delectamur, immodicis irascimur.'

Phaedrus V. vi. 1 sqq. 'Inuenit caluus forte in triuio pectinem. | accessit alter, aequae defectus pilis. | "Heia!" inquit "in commune quodcumque est lucri."'

Seneca *Epist. Moral.* 119 init. 'Quotiens aliquid inueni, non expecto donec dicas "in commune:" ipse mihi dico.'

Phaedrus *Appendix Perottena* ii. 1 sq. 'Arbitrio si Natura finxisset meo | genus mortale, longe foret instructius.'

Seneca *Oedipus* 882 (903) sq. 'Fata si liceat mihi | fingere arbitrio meo.'

*'alte cinctus' Phaedrus II. v. 11. So Seneca *Epist. Moral.* 33. 2, 92. 35.

'auocare' 'distract' Phaedrus *App.* P. xiv. 26. So Seneca *ad Polybium* 17. 6 and elsewhere.

'delicium' Phaedrus IV. 1. 8. 'delicium' and 'delicium' Seneca *Epist. Moral.* 12. 3.

'fatigare caelum' Phaedrus IV. xx.

(xxi.) 24. Seneca 'fatigare deos' *Epist. Moral.* 31. 5.

'immolare = occidere' Phaedrus IV. vi. 9. Seneca *N.Q. l.c.* § 9.

*'inuoluere ingenium' Phaedrus IV. vii. 14. Seneca 'cor inuolutum' *N.Q. I. Praef.* 6.

*'meliusculus' of good looks Phaedrus *App.* xv. 7. Seneca *de Beneficiis* I. 3. 9.

'nasutē' or 'nasutē' Phaedrus IV. 7. 1. 'nasutē' Seneca *de Beneficiis* V. 6. 6.

'persto' of slaves kept standing at their posts Phaedrus *App.* P. xviii. 8. So Seneca *Epist. Moral.* 47. 8.

'petra' Phaedrus *App.* xx. 2. Seneca *Agam.* 468.

*'prospicere' 'catch sight of' 'get a glimpse of' Phaedrus *App.* xiii. 16. Seneca *Epist. Moral.* 79. 12, 83. 1.

'retorridus' Phaedrus IV. ii. 16 (*Met.*). Seneca *Epist. Moral.* 12. 2 and other places (Summers *ad loc.*).

*'strigare' Phaedrus III. vi. 9. Seneca *Epist. Moral.* 31. 4.

'strophā' Phaedrus I. xiv. 4. Seneca *Epist. Moral.* 26. 5.

The tragedies of Seneca present in two or three instances iambic lines which in expression and structure recall senarii of Phaedrus. M. Havet cites 'irato impetu' ending a verse in Phaedrus III. 11. 14 ('horrendo impetu' in I. xi. 10) and Seneca *Troad.* 1159. Similarly 'scelere funesto domum' III. 10. 50 and 'caede funesta domum' Seneca *Phaedra* 1275. Also III. prol. 58 'qui saxa cantu mouit et domuit feras' and Seneca *Medea* 229 'qui saxa cantu mulcet et siluas trahit.' Another correspondence is noticed below.

The following observations arise out of the material. In IV. vii. 9 'opere Palladio' has been changed by L. Mueller and others to 'opera Palladia' on the ground that Pallas is not generally represented as working at the Argo. M. Havet has defended the text by Claudian *Bell. Pollent.* 18. The parallel from Seneca is nearer.

Consideration of IV. xxii. (xxiii.) raises an interesting question. The dictum 'omnia mea mecum sunt' is given by the fabulist to Simonides and by the philosopher to Stilpon. Is this

due to independent use of different sources or is the philosopher consciously correcting a predecessor? This would certainly be in the Annaean manner; compare what is said about Lucan in my Introduction to Book VIII. p. xxxvi, n. 4. The true authorship of the *mot* it is not very easy nor vastly important to determine. The poet may be right in ascribing it to a poet, and the philosopher to whom the philosopher assigns it may have borrowed or repeated it. It is not altogether irrelevant to add that Seneca shows himself aware of the difference between two notabilities, Demetrius Poliorcetes and Demetrius Phalereus, whom our author has confused in a passage corruptly given in our texts. V. I. 1 sq.:

Demetrius qui dictus est Phalereus
Athenas occupavit imperio improbo.

Even with the present reading of ver. 1 the blunder (the converse form of which appears in Aelian *Var. Hist.* 9. 9, so that it may have been taken over by Phaedrus from some Greek) is undeniable; compare in addition to ver. 2 the 'tyrannus' of ver. 14 and the 'qua sunt oppressi manum' of ver. 5. But it comes into clearer light when that verse is corrected. The vulgate reading is faulty on two accounts. In the first place, it neglects an important part of the MS. evidence. 'Demetrius qui' is the reading of the *Pithocanus* and the Perottine MSS., but in the lost *Remensis rex* was added after 'Demetrius,' and that this is no corruption is shown by its appearance in the heading of the poem in the *Pithocanus* 'Demetrius Rex et Menander Poeta.' In the second place the scansion Phalerēūs (from Greek Φαληρέως) is unexampled in Latin verse.

Professor Housman on Manilius I. 350 has already disposed of all the examples by which M. Havet (*ad loc.*) has sought to defend it; and it only remains here to write in conformity with the indications of the MSS.:

Demetrius rex qui Phalereus dictus est.

Changes of the order of words to one more easy or more familiar are common enough in the tradition of Phaedrus.

'Alticinctis' is the received reading at

II. v. 11 'ex alticinctis unus atriensibus.' It is however weakly supported by the MSS.; for both P and R divide it 'alticinctis' and the MSS. of Phaedrus confuse *e* and *i* perpetually. Apart from this the word has nothing to rest on except a gloss of uncertain origin and value 'ἀνεσταλμένος, alticinctus' *Corp. Gl.* II. 226, which can hardly be set against the consistent usage of Horace, Seneca, whom I cite because M. Havet says 'sic metro coactus Hor. S. II. 8. 10,' and Petronius. Phaedrus shows no liking for such compounds as *alticinctus* as we may infer from his 'sus nemoris cultrix' II. iv. 3 by the side of Catullus's 'cerua siluicultrix . . . aper nemoriuagus.'

IV. vii. 14 'saeuum ingenium uariis inuoluens modis' has been altered in various ways, Guyet and Heinsius conjecturing *euoluens* and M. Havet *conuoluens*. But Seneca's phrase seems to show that it may stand, though *dobis* (Heinsius) would be an improvement on *modis*.

App. xv. 7 'adeone per me uideor tibi meliuscula?' M. Havet's *uenustula* is elegant and has proved attractive. But that it is not necessary on the ground of metre he admits himself, and *meliusculus*, like *bonus* (Catullus 37. 19; cf. Propertius II. 28. 12 and elsewhere) was colloquially used of 'good' looks.

In *App.* xiii. 16 'paulum reclusis foribus miles prospicit' the usage of Seneca, and especially that in *Ep.* 83. 1 'tamquam aliquis in pectus intimum prospicere possit,' leads me now to doubt my 'perspicit,' although accepted by Dr. Gow and commended by Professor Housman (*C.R.* XIV. p. 467).

In II. v. 23 'tum sic iocata est tanta maiestas ducis' Pithou's *tanti* has been widely accepted without sufficient reason, as we may see from Seneca *Herc. F.* 721 sq. 'in quo superbo digerit uultu sedens | animas recentes *dira maiestas dei*' (with Leo's repunctuation); cf. for the metrical turn *Phaedra* 915, 'ubi uultus ille et *ficta maiestas uiri*.' M. Havet's citation of 'tanto ducis' from Martial XI. 8. 6 by no means shows that in a writer with Phaedrus's weakness for abstract nouns *tanta* cannot agree with *maiestas*.

III. vi. 9 *tricandum* is the reading

generally adopted from PR, but the meaning of 'shirking' is neither properly attested nor sufficiently appropriate to the passage, nor again does it explain the *tardandum* of N (an explanation of *strigandum*) nor the *saltandum* of V. It appears to be simply a corruption easy enough of *strigandum* (the conjecture of Gruter and Salmasius) for which compare *App. Vergiliana Catal.* 10 (8) 19.

On *sine mercede* in IV. ii. 8 'hoc ne locutus sine mercede existimer, | fabelam adiciam de mustela et muribus' which has driven the commentators to most contorted interpretations. I briefly wrote in the *Classical Quarterly* of April, 1918, p. 91: 'Sometimes the gloss may be detected by its senselessness. So "sine mercede" IV. 2. 8 which should be *gratuito*.' My view was that Phaedrus here meant to say he would show in his accustomed manner by means of a fable that the dictum 'appearances deceive' was no uncalled-for and idle utterance, and that the *gratuito* which he used in the sense of 'causelessly', 'without motive', 'unwarrantably' (cf. Sallust *Cat.* 16. 3 '*gratuito* potius malus atque crudelis erat,' '*gratuitum* odium' Seneca *Epist. Moral.* 105. 3 and '*gratis* anhelans' of the officious and uncalled-for attentions of the *atriensis* in II. v. 3) was misinterpreted by some scribe; whose infelicitous comment 'without fee' or 'remuneration' had crept into the text. This might well have happened. But that Phaedrus may here have deviated from his practice and have represented the following fable as a 'fee' or payment for attention to his moralising seems also possible when we compare a curious procedure of Seneca in the first three books of his *Moral Epistles*. At the end of all but every letter he adds an 'aureum dictum' as we might call it, some pithy or weighty saying which he frequently calls its '*mercedula*,' '*peculium*,' '*munus*' or '*munusculum*.' It is enough to quote 8. 7 '*sed iam finis faciendus est et aliquid, ut institui, pro hac epistula dependendum*,' 10. 5 '*ut more meo cum aliquo munusculo epistulam mittam*,' 12. 10 '*sed iam debeo epistulam includere. sic*' inquis '*sine ullo ad me peculio ueniet*,' 15. 9 '*una mercedula et*

unum graecum ad haec beneficia accedet, ecce insigne praeceptum' e.q.s.

Having thus set out not indeed the whole but probably the greater and most noteworthy part of the correspondences between Seneca and Phaedrus, and having considered their value to an editor of the fabulist, we may turn to the question of their inner significance. We may note two facts to begin with. They are almost all to be found in the books that follow the first. We cannot indeed assign to their proper places the fables contained in the Perottine Appendix; but thus much we know, that the imperfect manuscript from which they were drawn contained no fable earlier than II. vi. Next the similarities in diction seem to be largely colloquialisms, and as such might be due to Seneca and Phaedrus using a common style. Are we to stop here and neither assert nor deny that they indicate that the Fables were known to the philosopher? Before we can decide we must consider the other factors in the question.

Martial was aware of Phaedrus III. 20. 5 'an aemulatur improbi iocos Phaedri?' Our conviction that this verse refers to our Phaedrus is not shaken by the astounding declaration of Friedlaender, *ad loc.* that the Fables are neither '*ioci*' nor in any sense '*improbi*.' That the Fables were not '*ioci*' to Friedlaender is a matter of no importance; we know that Phaedrus thought them such; Prologue to Book I. '*duplex libelli dos est quod risum monet | et quod prudenti uitam consilio mouet . . . | fictis iocari nos meminerit fabulis*.' And if some of his pieces are not '*improbi*' *Ag.* I. xviii., xxix.; III. iii. xi.; IV. xv. xviii. with others, it is hard to see what sense attaches to the word. But indeed there is no necessity to argue the question; for Martial according to a custom by no means rare in the literary references of Roman poetry has pointed his allusions to the works of Phaedrus by using words *iocus* and *improbus*, that his readers would recognise as special favourites of that writer.¹ Of this 'semi-quotation,' as

¹ *iocus* with its congeners occurs some eleven times, *improbus* (with *improbitas*) some seventeen times in the extant Fables.

we may call it, Statius has more than one example; *Silvae* I. 2. 252-255 (of Propertius and Tibullus) and several passages in II. 7 (the birthday ode to Lucan).

Quintilian will be our second witness. For we can hardly doubt that the *poeta* of *Inst. Or.* I. 9. 2 who composed 'Aesopi fabellas . . . sermone puro et nihil se supra modum extollente' and whose 'gracilitas' is to be reproduced in the school exercises was Phaedrus.¹ The Fables then, or rather a selection from them, were a schoolbook at Rome towards the end of the first century A.D. When they attained to this deadly distinction we cannot say. For some forty years previously there is no mention of them or sign of their existence. In this dearth of data the hungry critic has turned to a well-known passage in one of the *Dialogi* of Seneca addressed to Polybius, the powerful freedman of Claudius, in the hope that he would use his influence to get the philosopher permission to return to Rome. The words are 'non audeo te eo usque producere ut fabellas quoque et Aesopeos logos, intemptatum Romanis ingeniis opus, solita tibi uenustate conectas' 8. 3. This has been rightly held to show that Seneca, writing from Corsica circa 43, the probable date of this 'dialogue,' either did not know the Fables or chose deliberately to ignore them. What we know from the Fables themselves about the times of their composition may be summed up in a sentence: Phaedrus had written fables which, if not published, had obtained such currency as to bring him under the notice of Seianus some time before the fall of the Prefect in 31; and he continued to do so till after 37, the year of Tiberius's death. It is possible that he was writing under Claudius, as IV. xiv. (a fragment in our MSS. of which the Paraphrasts have preserved the continuation) is naturally taken to

refer to Caligula. But we cannot point to anything that proves he was writing later than 41, the year of Seneca's banishment. The theory then that to this exile should be ascribed Seneca's seeming ignorance of his work lacks all solid foundation. An earlier absence in Egypt, the date of which cannot be determined, might be used to explain the paucity of coincidences with the first book of Phaedrus; but that in 43 the philosopher should have been wholly ignorant of the existence of the Fables is undeniably strange. If he were not, the statement that Aesopean Fable was a form of literature 'un-essayed by Roman talents' is hardly less astonishing. Does it mean that to Seneca Phaedrus, in spite of his pretensions (II. epil. 9), did not count because he was not a native Roman?² An odd argument for an immigrant from Spain to address to a Greek or Asiatic freedman! Or is it a conscious perversion of fact to open the way for a compliment to the powerful favourite? It would not then be out of keeping with the adulations of the Empress Messalina and the freedmen of Claudius, which we are told by Dio Cassius (61. 10. 2) Seneca afterwards out of mere shame did his best to suppress (*ἀπήλειψεν*).³

To sum up, it seems antecedently very improbable that Seneca should have remained without knowledge of all the five books of the Fables from the time of their publication to the end of his life, and the resemblances between the fabulist and the philosopher are, so

¹ No argument can be based on the use of the common instead of the proper name. The use is both natural (*cf. δ ποιητής* in Greek) and appropriate. Phaedrus himself called his fables Aesopiac, and as only a selection from them would be included in the school anthology, there was no special call to give his name.

² There is little in the idioms or diction of Phaedrus to suggest the foreigner. His use of abstract nouns is certainly pushed beyond the Latin norm. Of *mehercules* in the mouth of Minerva, III. xvii. 8, M. Havet writes with reason *satís mira uox in ore et femineo et diuino*, Gell. XI. 8. 3 (Gellius says it is not so used 'apud idoneos quidem scriptores,' but he might perhaps have excused it from an undoubted virago). *Gruis* for *grus* I. i. 7 offends us more. It would certainly have made Priscian 'gasp'; *cf. Neue-Wagener Formenlehre* I. p. 278. One is sorely tempted to suggest 'tandem persuasumst iure iurando grui.'

³ The questions arising out of the passage of Seneca have been carefully and soberly discussed in W. Isleib's *de Senecae Dialogo Undecimo*, a Marburg degree dissertation of 1906.

far as they go, not inconsistent with this conclusion. On the other hand our data are so meagre and elusive that we are not warranted in assuming that

when he wrote to Polybius in 43 he was already aware of their existence.

J. P. POSTGATE.

Liverpool.

NOTES

IMANTEAΙΓΜΟΣ.

AT our fairs and racecourses we may make acquaintance with certain arts and mysteries of great subtlety and immense antiquity, though of this antiquity we have all too little actual proof. A learned mathematician showed us very lately that the gipsy trick of fitting five round discs on to a little round table (I saw it only the other day at our ancient fair of St. Andrews) is a matter involving very complicated geometry, and this geometry (I believe) is closely akin to that of problems which perplexed Pythagoras. I shouldn't wonder at all if the professors of thimble-rigging and the three-card trick had their little side-shows at the Olympic Games, just as at Epsom; and there is at least one of their mysteries of which we know what the Greeks called it. Its name is *ἱμαντελογμός*, and we find it in the *Onomasticon* of Julius Pollux. Many of us are quite familiar with the pastime (if I may so call it), and yet the word would seem to be little known and less understood by classical scholars. The expert lays upon a table a loop or *doublet* of thin strap-leather, and then, folding and winding it into flat labyrinthine coils, he invites the curious to 'prick the tape'; that is to say, to insert a pin or little pointed stick (*παττάλιον*) amid the coils in such a manner that it shall be found entangled in the loop when the coils are resolved. It would seem that little skill were necessary for so doing, and that the chances of success were at least even; nevertheless, it is found on trial that, when experience twists the tape and innocence directs the pin, the tape *invariably* comes away loose without implicating the pin. Pollux's description is lucidity itself: *ὁ δὲ ἱμαντελογμός, διπλοῦ ἱμάντος λαβυρινθώδης τις ἔστι περιστροφή· καθ'*

ἥς ἔδει καθέντα παττάλιον τῆς διπλῆς τυχεῖν. εἰ γὰρ μὴ λυθέντος [? λυθέντι] ἐμπεριέλγητο τῷ ἱμάντι τὸ παττάλιον, ἤττητο ὁ καθεῖς. It is noteworthy, however, that the lexicographer throws no light upon the secret of successful operation.

The subject is alluded to by Eustathius as *διπλοῦ ἱμάντος σκολία τις εἴλησις* and is briefly discussed by Meursius and by Bulangerus in their well-known treatises *De Ludis Græcorum Veterum*; but neither the Leyden Professor nor the Jesuit Father show any personal acquaintance with the subject, and Bulangerus goes obviously astray when he interprets *παττάλιον* as 'clavum vel pessulum ligneum, qui indebatur ut solveret complicationem.' Nor does Hemsterhusius come nearer to the point: 'hic mihi venit in mentem nodi Gordii, qui simili modo forsitan fuit involutus, similique solvendus?' Liddell and Scott give the brief and unsatisfactory definition '*rope-twisting, a game*'; from which we may surmise that these authors also had never been invited to 'prick the tape.' They consequently fail equally, I think, to appreciate the meaning of the derivative *ἱμαντελικής*, in Plutarch, which word they define as a '*twister of ropes, or, metaphorically, a knotty sophist.*' That is all very well; but I imagine that the epithet, as one sophist used it of another, was more caustic and less polite. It is indeed possible that the one philosopher only meant to tell the other that he was a maker of paradoxes; but I very much fear that he had it in mind to call him a low gipsy vagabond, a card-sharper, and a thimble-rigger. Regarding which latter mystery, by the way, I take it that scholars are sufficiently informed.

D'ARCY WENTWORTH THOMPSON.

St. Andrews.